

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

MONTY WARNER,

$$\begin{array}{c}) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \\) \end{array}$$

Case No. ALLO-00-0028

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, and LEANA LAMB, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated June 27, 2000. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Appeals Board in Olympia, Washington, on April 3, 2001. GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, did not participate in the hearing or decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant Monty Warner was present and appeared *pro se*. Respondent Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS) was represented by Pam Pelton, Classification and Pay Manager.

Background. Appellant submitted a Classification Questionnaire (CQ) dated June 2, 1999 as part of the Information Technology Class Study conducted by the Department of Personnel in response to the newly adopted class series. By letter dated July 14, 1999, Donna Mills, Personnel Assistant

1 for DSHS, informed Appellant that his position was allocated to the Information Technology
2 Systems Specialist (ITSS) 3 classification. On August 12, 1999, Appellant appealed this
3 determination to the director of the Department of Personnel. On June 6, 2000, the director's
4 designee, Hearings Officer Paul Peterson, conducted an allocation review of Appellant's position.
5 By letter dated June 27, 2000, Mr. Peterson informed Appellant that his position was properly
6 allocated to the ITSS3 classification. On July 19, 2000, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's
7 determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of these
8 proceedings.

10 Appellant works for the Office of Support Enforcement with the Division of Child Support (DCS)
11 at the DSHS Region 6 office headquarters building in Lacey, Washington. DCS Region 6 also has
12 a branch office located in Vancouver, Washington, however, the regional administrator is located in
13 Lacey. Also located in the Lacey Region 6 office on a temporary basis is a branch office of
14 Employment Security Department and the DSHS Office of Equal Employment Opportunity.

16 Lake Village is comprises of a number of units: P

17 Appellant is assigned responsibility for Local Area Network (LAN) and Wide Area Network
18 (WAN). He is responsible for identifying moderate to severe operation problems. The question is
19 whether he performs this for "multiple business units with multiple business functions."

21 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant's primary exceptions are with the designee's
22 determination that the allocating criteria was applied consistently; that he is not officially assigned
23 responsibility for other entities outside the Office of Support Enforcement; that he does not provide
24 system support to multiple business functions or business units; and that he is not assigned systems
25 that have region-wide impact. Appellant argues that other IT staff at other field offices perform his
26

1 exact duties and have been reallocated to the ITSS 4 level, while he has been allocated to the ITSS
2 3 level.

3
4 Appellant argues that there are distinct business functions and distinct business units within the
5 DCS office. Appellant argues that they include the administrative, hearings, mailroom and
6 collections units. Appellant argues that these units have no crossover in their duties and are diverse
7 with different and specific business functions. Appellant argues that he provided support to other
8 non-DCS entities co-located at the DCS office and that these non-DCS staff were dependent on him
9 for total information technology support and consultation. Appellant asserts that the support was
10 not temporary but long-term and ongoing, that he received a verbal directive to provide the support
11 but that management refused to put it in writing. Appellant argues, however, that the support he
12 provided should constitute an officially assigned responsibility.
13

14
15 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that multiple business functions are
16 comprised of more than one DSHS division and the divisions' computer functions. Respondent
17 argues that they include the need for serving, servicing and designing/maintaining the needs of the
18 divisions' program missions and aligning the multiple program computer systems to meet the needs
19 of the primary division where the employee reports. Respondent argues that it does not allocate a
20 position on the basis of how many different/multiple computer systems are within one division, but
21 rather it evaluates how the incumbent works with the multiple divisions, understands their program
22 needs and mission and can incorporate their primary divisions' missions and adjust the other
23 division's program computer systems to accommodate their primary division. Respondent argues
24 that Appellant is not assigned to accommodate multiple business functions because there is no other
25
26

1 DSHS division housed within DCS. Respondent argues that Appellant is not responsible for setting
2 up the computer system of another division employee so that employee can access the mainframes
3 of both the DCS system as well as his/her division's own system.

4
5 Respondent argues that Appellant is not assigned systems that have a region-wide impact.
6 Respondent further argues that Appellant's duties do not require that he spend a majority of his
7 work time providing support to regional DCS and non-DCS staff. Respondent contends that
8 although the Office of Equal Opportunity and a branch of the Employment Security Department
9 were tenants of the DCS, this was temporary in nature and that permanent official support was
10 provided by other information system division's personnel. Respondent argues that Appellant is
11 not officially assigned responsibility for any other entities outside of the DCS and that his position
12 does not meet the definition and distinguishing characteristics of the ITSS 4 level which requires
13 performance of higher level, complex duties the majority of time.
14

15
16 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
17 to the Information Technology System Specialist 4 classification should be affirmed.
18

19 **Relevant Classifications.** Information Technology System Specialist 3, class code 03273; and
20 Information Technology System Specialist 4, class code 03274.
21

22 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
23 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
24 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
25 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
26

1 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
2 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
3 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
4 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

5
6 Position allocations are “based upon an investigation of duties and responsibilities assigned and/or
7 performed and other information and recommendations.” (WAC 356-20-200). Because a current
8 and accurate description of a position’s duties and responsibilities is documented in an approved
9 classification questionnaire, the classification questionnaire becomes the basis for allocation of a
10 position. An allocation determination must be based on the overall duties and responsibilities, as
11 documented in the CQ.

12
13 At the ITSS 3 level, incumbents perform journey professional level duties with independent
14 responsibility for projects, problem identification, and problem resolution **within their areas of**
15 **responsibility** (emphasis added).
16

17
18 At the ITSS 4 level, incumbents perform senior professional-level duties with a focus on
19 independently evaluating and meeting complex system needs of a **region** or other similar
20 organization (emphasis added).
21

22 When Appellant prepared his CQ, he wrote that he provided:

23 professional level consultative support to the regional office for management
24 regarding the planning, administration, operation and troubleshooting of PC
25 equipment and Local Area Networks in the NOVELL Token Ring and Ethernet
26 HUB environments. Including working with data communications to a UNISYS

1 host mainframe. . . . Providing administration and support of multi-business
2 applications . . .

3 Appellant's immediate supervisor disagreed with the duties listed on Appellant's CQs. Rather,
4 Appellant's supervisor clarified that Appellant provides consultative and technical support to the
5 DCS office in Lacey; that he collaborates on problems/solutions with the Vancouver IT staff; that
6 his responsible for setting his own work priorities on a day-to-day basis with management's
7 discretion to change work priorities to accomplish specific tasks or projects. Appellant's supervisor
8 admitted that on an infrequent basis, Appellant assisted other entities, but asserted that 90 percent of
9 Appellant's duties were limited to the end-users at the Lacey location.

10
11 The documents in the record support his supervisor's description of Appellant's duties. Appellant
12 provides support to the Lacey Region 6 DCS office, and on a more limited basis, he assisted
13 employees of other agencies, who were once temporarily co-located in the same building, with
14 troubleshooting their computer problems. The majority of Appellant's responsibilities do not
15 impact a region, geographical grouping of offices/facilities, or multiple business units with multiple
16 business functions. The primary focus of Appellant's duties and responsibilities include
17 responsibility for providing consultative and technical support to the Lacey DCS office and its staff
18 members.

19
20
21 Appellant has failed to establish that the work he performs meets the definition or the distinguishing
22 characteristics necessary for his position to be allocated to the ITSS 4 classification.

23
24 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's
25 determination dated June 27, 2000, should be affirmed and adopted.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the attached Director's determination dated June 27, 2000, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

Leana D. Lamb, Member